

REMARKS

Claims 1-4 are pending. Claims 1-3 are amended and Claim 4 added by this Amendment. Because support for the amendments and newly recited subject matter of Claim 4 are provided in the originally filed application, for example, Figures 3, 6 and 9, as well as page 12, lines 13-17, Applicant respectfully submits no new matter is presented herein.

Claim Rejections – 35 U.S.C. §103

Claim 1 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent Number 6,091,172 to Kakinuma et al. (Kakinuma) in view of U.S. Patent Number 6,030,260 to Kikuchi et al. (Kikuchi); Claim 2 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Kakinuma in view of Kikuchi as applied to Claim 1, and further in view of U.S. Patent Application Publication Number 2004/0061390 to Baker-Bachman et al. (Baker-Bachman); and Claim 3 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Kakinuma and Kikuchi, in view of Baker-Bachman as applied to Claims 1-2 above, and further in view of U.S. Patent Number 5,755,021 to Beakes et al. (Beakes).

Applicant respectfully traverses the rejections for at least the following reason(s).

Claims 1-4 each recite, among other features, an outer rotor type multi-pole generator stator including, among other features, a bobbin having a fitting hole defined therein and which receives an external conductor connection terminal portion therein, and a channel or through hole defined in the bobbin into

which an electrode extends, wherein the channel or through hole has a diameter larger than a diameter of the fitting hole.

Applicants respectfully submit that the applied art of record fail to teach or suggest such a feature.

For example, Applicant notes that, as admitted by the Office Action, the bobbin (18) of Kakinuma only has one or a single hole or channel (fitting tube 30) defined therein. That is, while the flat plate-shaped portion 25a of the terminal member 25 is received by the fitting tube 30, Applicant respectfully points out that Kakinuma does not teach or suggest the bobbin (18) having a second aperture (hole or channel) defined therein, let alone a second aperture that has a larger diameter than the diameter of the fitting tube, and further a second aperture having a larger diameter than a diameter of the fitting tube into which an electrode extends. See Figures 3 and 9 of Kakinuma. Applicant further submits that Kakinuma fails to teach or suggest the concept of an electrode extending into any portion of the bobbin (18).

The Office Action looks to Kikuchi for curing the admitted deficiency of Kakinuma. Applicant notes that Kikuchi teaches a bobbin (34) having a plurality of holes or apertures defined therein, see, for example, fitting bores (39₁ and 39₂) and engage bore (56). Applicant notes that the fitting bores (39₁ and 39₂) have the same diameter and each receives a corresponding connecting terminal (45₁ and 45₂) therein. Also, Applicant respectfully submits that even if one of the fitting bores (39₁ or 39₂) has a diameter larger than a diameter of the other fitting bore (39₁ or 39₂), an electrode does not extend into either of fitting bores (39₁ and

39₂) since a corresponding connecting terminal (45₁ and 45₂) extends therein. See column 3, line 54 to column 4, line 54 and Figures 4 and 9 of Kikuchi which specifically teaches the structural arrangement of the fitting bores and their corresponding connecting terminals.

Moreover, while the engage bore (56) appears to have a diameter larger than a diameter of either one of the fitting bores (39₁ and 39₂), Applicant respectfully notes that the engage bore (56) only receives the engage claw (58) of the coupler (46₁). See the paragraph bridging columns 6 and 7 and Figures 4 and 9 of Kikuchi. Put simply, Kikuchi, like Kakinuma, fails to teach or suggest a bobbin having an aperture, hole or channel defined therein into which an electrode extends. As such, Applicant respectfully submits that Kikuchi fails to cure the above-described deficiency of Kakinuma and one of ordinary skill in the art would not deem it obvious to modify Kakinuma according to the teachings of Kikuchi because to do so would not arrive at the invention recited by Claims 1-4.

Baker-Bachman is applied for teaching terminals having different geometric shapes. As such, Applicant respectfully submits that Baker-Bachman fails to cure the above-described deficiencies of Kakinuma and Kikuchi.

Beakes is applied for teaching it is known to cut off the unwanted portions of a lead wire. As such, Applicant respectfully submits that Beakes fails to cure the above-described deficiencies of Kakinuma, Kikuchi and Baker-Bachman.

For the above provided reasons, Applicant respectfully submits that the applied art of record fails to teach or suggest the features recited by Claims 1-4, that Claims 1-4 are not rendered obvious in view of the teachings of the applied

art of record, that Claims 1-4 should be deemed allowable over the applied art of record, and that the rejections of Claims 1-3 should be withdrawn.

Conclusion

In view of the above, reconsideration of the application, withdrawal of the outstanding rejections, allowance of Claims 1-4, and the prompt issuance of a Notice of Allowance is respectfully requested.

Should the Examiner believe anything further is desirable in order to place this application in better condition for allowance, the Examiner is requested to contact the undersigned at the telephone number listed below.

In the event this paper is not considered to be timely filed, the Applicant respectfully petitions for an appropriate extension of time. Any fees for such an extension, together with any additional fees that may be due with respect to this paper, may be charged to counsel's Deposit Account No. 01-2300, **referencing docket number 107348.00474.**

Respectfully submitted,
ARENT FOX LLP



Murat Ozgu
Attorney for Applicant
Registration No. 44,275

Customer No. 004372

Arent Fox LLP
1050 Connecticut Avenue, NW, Suite 400
Washington, DC 20036-5339
Telephone: (202) 857-6000

MO/elp